

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ANALYSIS OF THE CRISIS IN BOSNIA

HON. HARRY JOHNSTON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to introduce into the RECORD our ranking member's insightful, thought-provoking analysis of the crisis in Bosnia.

CONTINUING CRISIS IN BOSNIA

(By Lee H. Hamilton)

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a pleasure to be here today and a privilege to address this distinguished group. The World Affairs Council of Washington has long fostered a better understanding of American foreign policy. It has served as an important forum for considering important foreign policy issues.

Today I want to talk about one of the toughest foreign policy issues since the end of the cold war: the war in Bosnia. It's at the top of the foreign policy agenda right now. It has evoked more frustration than any other foreign policy issue since the Vietnam war. It is an issue that will not go away, much as we would like it to.

Secretary Perry was right on the mark the other day when he said, "We are at a defining moment in this war, and the actions we take in the next few weeks are going to be very critical."

II. CRISIS IN BOSNIA TODAY

Before the fall of Srebrenica, the military, diplomatic and humanitarian situation in Bosnia was bleak enough. Today the agony of Bosnia is almost unbearable.

The UN peacekeeping operation, UNPROFOR, is on the verge of collapse. The UN and NATO no longer appear able—or willing—to fulfill the pledges they made to protect safe areas and establish weapons-free zones.

On the humanitarian front—in the past, one of the few achievements—aid shipments have also been blocked. There is starvation in some cities and events like Srebrenica only compound the humanitarian disaster.

Diplomacy, too, is at a standstill. Neither the Bosnian government nor the Bosnian Serbs seem interested in a diplomatic settlement. The Contact Group—the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and Germany—still has a peace plan and a map on the table. But the Contact Group has not yet convinced the Bosnian Serbs to accept the peace plan. Talks with Serbian President Milosevic to recognize Bosnia and undercut the Bosnian Serbs—in exchange for a partial lifting of the embargo—are also stalled.

The military picture is worsening. The deployment of the new 10,000-strong British-French-Dutch rapid reaction force to buttress UNPROFOR is a last ditch effort to prevent for the collapse of that mission. UNPROFOR may decide to leave soon if the fighting continues or if the remaining safe areas prove indefensible.

In short, we are on the verge of a new and dangerous phase in this tragic war.

There is a growing feeling in Congress that UNPROFOR has failed and should leave Bosnia and that the arms embargo should be

lifted to allow the Bosnian government to defend itself and to improve its position at the bargaining table.

Members of Congress also understand that the President has made a commitment to help UNPROFOR withdraw, if it comes to that. All that points to U.S. involvement.

On the other hand, I see little support, either in Congress or among the American people, for a U.S. military mission in Bosnia. President Clinton will have an uphill battle winning support in Congress for sending troops to Bosnia for any purpose.

The question is, are there any other options?

III. U.S. INTERESTS IN BOSNIA

The fundamental problem for U.S. policy in Bosnia is the gap between what we say we want to achieve and the resources we are willing to commit to this crisis.

The Clinton Administration came into office determined to address the humanitarian tragedy of Bosnia. But it soon made a judgment that the United States does not have vital national interests at stake in this war. I agree. Bosnia has no strategic or economic significance.

Whenever I return home to my district in Indiana, it is clear that Bosnia is of no real significance to the people of Indiana. It is not a place they are willing to send their children to fight and to die.

Yet, as President Clinton has emphasized, the U.S. has important interests. These interests include:

Preventing a wider war in the Balkans that could engulf our NATO allies and spread instability throughout Europe.

Stopping the slaughter of innocent civilians and securing the delivery of humanitarian assistance;

Maintaining NATO as a powerful and credible force in the post cold-war world; and

Maintaining the credibility of the United Nations and strengthening its ability to respond to future crises.

With the horrible ethnic cleansing and bombardment of civilian populations there is an understandable desire to respond—to help victims, punish aggression and stop the killing.

But U.S. foreign policy cannot respond to every tragedy around the world or attempt to right every wrong, especially when the American people do not favor intervention.

The only way to turn back Serb aggression in Bosnia is to send hundreds of thousands of ground troops into combat, and occupy Bosnia for many years to come. The United States has never considered doing that. Neither the President nor Congress, past or present, have been Bosnia as a vital American interest worth that enormous risk and sacrifice.

IV. POLICY CHOICES WE HAVE NOW

I know there have never been good choices or simple solutions to the war in Bosnia. We must deal within the narrow options dictated by the realities on the ground, domestic political pressures in the United States, and the policies of our allies.

Right now we have three basic options:

The first option is what I call Lift, Strike and Train.

Many in Congress believe that UNPROFOR has failed and should be withdrawn and that the arms embargo should be lifted.

A bill sponsored by Senators Dole and Lieberman will come up in the Senate this

week. It calls for the lifting of the embargo either after the withdrawal of UNPROFOR, or 12 weeks after the Bosnian government asks UNPROFOR to withdraw.

Some who support this option recognize that it commits the United States to war—through training and equipping Bosnian forces, and through air strikes to defend Bosnian forces until they can defend themselves.

Yet the chief sponsors of this proposal are silent on its consequences. They talk about "letting the Bosnian people defend themselves." But they do not spell out what happens next. Lifting the arms embargo is fraught with peril for the United States.

The basic fact is that if we lift the embargo, so will the Russians. There will still be no level playing field in Bosnia, just more weapons on each side and wider war. We run the risk of getting drawn into a proxy war with Russia in the Balkans, the sort of nightmare scenario we sought to avoid during 40 years of the Cold War.

Unless NATO is willing to launch air strikes to protect the Bosnians, the Bosnian Serbs—with Serbia's help—will crush them in the time it will take to train and supply Bosnian forces. If the air strikes are not enough, the allies will be forced either to retreat or escalate with ground forces.

If lifting the embargo is anything more than rhetoric, the sponsors have an obligation to spell out their strategy. Who will supply the arms? Who will deliver them? Who will train the Bosnians to use them? Who's going to pay for them? Who will protect them while they are training?

The answer to all these questions is the United States. The United States will also have to feed and protect the civilian population once UNPROFOR leaves.

The Dole proposal does not address these concerns. In fact, it just hands over a key U.S. foreign policy decision to the Bosnian government. We tell the Bosnian government: You decide. Make a request to lift the embargo, and we'll do it. No discretion. No judgment. Just do it.

In the process of lifting the embargo, the Dole proposal will kill the initiative to strengthen UNPROFOR, force UN peacekeepers to withdraw instead and trigger the deployment of 25,000 U.S. troops to assist in that withdrawal.

In short, the Dole proposal means direct U.S. military intervention in Bosnia. That is precisely why the Bosnian government supports it.

The second option is to get UNPROFOR out and let the parties fight it out.

There is a growing sense that the UN is no longer able to carry out its mission in Bosnia, and that the parties themselves do not want to make peace.

According to this view, we should set a date certain for the termination of UNPROFOR—perhaps at the end of its current mandate at the end of November—if there is no progress on the negotiating front.

We must understand how difficult this business of withdrawal is going to be. It is not going to be a quick, easy, risk-free withdrawal.

A pullout by UNPROFOR, with or without a lifting of the arms embargo, will involve U.S. troops on the ground in Bosnia. In theory, they would be in Bosnia for only a matter of weeks, and only to help UNPROFOR

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

withdraw. They would not be involved in combat. But a withdrawal mission will almost certainly expose U.S. troops to hostile fire. Casualties are likely.

The withdrawal of UNPROFOR also threatens to trap U.S. troops in Bosnia. UNPROFOR'S pullout would leave the people of Bosnia exposed to humanitarian disaster. The presence of a well-armed, disciplined U.S. force in the midst of that disaster would lead to enormous pressure on that force to stay—to protect civilians, deliver humanitarian supplies, and even takes sides in the war. It will be difficult to resist that pressure.

Even if we want to leave, we may not be able to. Tens of thousands of Bosnian refugees, left in dire circumstances, will rush to the withdrawal forces for protection. They will try to block UNPROFOR'S withdrawal.

Remember, too, that as the UN peacekeepers leave, the contending parties are likely to grab more land. We will have to decide whether to use our air power and combat troops in response.

In short, there will be no such thing as an orderly withdrawal from Bosnia.

The third option is to strengthen UN peacekeeping and continue negotiations.

The proposal to strengthen UNPROFOR, stay the course, and focus on moving the parties toward a negotiated settlement is the least bad option. It will not provide a moral and just settlement, but at least it will stop the killing. This is a realistic and responsible policy.

Keeping UNPROFOR in Bosnia, beefed up by the Rapid Reaction Force, at least for the next two to three months, gives negotiations one last chance. We should support French and British efforts to protect remaining safe havens. I have doubts about an airlift using American helicopters to ferry British and French troops into Gorazde. The use of more aggressive air strikes against the Serbs certainly must be considered.

Maintaining the unity and cohesion in NATO must remain a paramount U.S. strategic consideration. We should act together with our NATO allies. I do not want Bosnia to become the sole responsibility of the United States. Whatever we do should be in cooperation with the Europeans and others whose troops are exposed on the ground.

There is no acceptable alternative. Any other course of action would provoke the collapse of UNPROFOR, a wider war, and the deployment of U.S. ground troops in the middle of a dangerous war.

For all of its obvious shortcomings UNPROFOR has produced much good in Bosnia.

UNPROFOR has kept hundreds of thousands of people alive through the delivery of humanitarian aid.

UNPROFOR has helped contain the fighting. In the first year of the war, 1992, there were upwards of 100,000 casualties before the deployment of UNPROFOR. This past year, the number of casualties was 3000. If UNPROFOR goes, we risk rekindling savagery of the magnitude that led to its deployment in the first place.

Time may be running out on this option, but we should still give it more time before we pull UNPROFOR out.

We must also do everything possible to get the peace negotiations back on track.

The only way to stop the killing and end this war is through a negotiated agreement acceptable to all sides—not wider war. We must continue to search for diplomatic, political and economic steps that will press the parties, especially the Serbs, to accept a peaceful outcome.

We must exploit the desire of the Serbs throughout the former Yugoslavia for recognition, acceptance and re-integration into the world community.

To gain concessions at the negotiating table, we must use as leverage Milosevic's political and economic need to end the sanctions and re-enter the world community.

We must be flexible enough in these negotiations to facilitate an agreement that will reflect realities on the ground—yet be fair enough to secure Bosnia as an integral state, however decentralized that state may be.

We must be realistic and flexible for one key reason: In the absence of NATO ground troops—including the U.S.—the Bosnian government stands to gain more territory at the peace table than it can ever gain on the battlefield.

V. ENDING POLICY AMBIGUITY

I urge the Clinton Administration to adopt this third option—to strengthen UN peacekeeping and press forward with negotiations—and stick with it.

Past ambiguities in U.S. policy have prolonged this war. Last year, I advised our top policymakers that it was time for brutal honesty on Bosnia.

Candor and honesty would have been helpful then, and are urgent now.

We have not been straightforward with the Bosnian government. They are still waiting for us to come to the rescue. We must be honest with them, and with ourselves. We should make it clear to the Bosnian government that it should get the best deal it can, because the cavalry is not coming to the rescue.

We have been trying to please all sides. We want to support the Bosnian government against Serbian aggression, we want to keep U.S. troops out of Bosnia, and we want to end the war. But these goals are not compatible. It is impossible to achieve any one of these goals without compromising the other two.

We must choose: do we want to fuel an open-ended Balkan war with uncertain outcome or do we want to work with our friends and allies to stop the killing?

VI. CONCLUSION

Bosnia has been a hellish problem for this Administration, and for this country. There are no heroes among the policymakers, and there is plenty of blame to go around. We cannot undo what has happened in this war, absent a commitment of ground troops and resources that neither the United States nor its allies are prepared to make.

We need to end the war in Bosnia not only to stop the senseless killing, but because a failure to end it will have a continuing, corrosive impact on NATO and the United Nations. We need these institutions to address future crises through collective action.

If the parties in Bosnia want to fight, we can't stop them from fighting. Yet I believe we still have an opportunity to end this war. There have been opportunities for peace in the past that slipped away. The Contact Group plan and map are still on the table. The parties' differences are not that great—at least not in comparison to the costs of a looming all-out war.

We have one last chance to try to end this war before UNPROFOR may be forced to withdraw. I urge the President to use these few remaining weeks to clarify U.S. policy and press as hard as he can for a negotiated peace settlement in Bosnia—before he is called upon to send U.S. ground troops to help our NATO allies leave.

FREEDOM FROM UNION VIOLENCE ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, we in the House have devoted a great deal of attention to the issue of crime in the United States, and have passed several anticrime bills. While we have not always agreed on the proper methods to reduce crime in America, Members of this body have unanimously condemned acts of violence.

To me, therefore, it is inconceivable that this Congress has not moved to outlaw certain acts of violence that have been protected by the Supreme Court since 1973. That year, the Court ruled in its *Enmons* decision that union officials were exempt from prosecution for acts of violence, if they were used to gain legitimate union objectives. The *Enmons* decision severely restricted the scope of the 1946 Hobbs Anti-Extortion Act. The Hobbs Act was enacted primarily to quell violence and extortion by union members and officials as they enforced compulsory union membership. By exempting union officials from the Hobbs Act, the High Court effectively sanctioned these acts of violence.

The results of this decision have been devastating. Since 1973, union violence resulted in 181 murders, 440 assaults, and more than 6,000 acts of vandalism. In fact, from 1975 to 1993, there were more than 7,800 acts of documented union violence. I believe that this violence must stop.

On June 8, 1995, I introduced H.R. 1796, the Freedom From Union Violence Act. H.R. 1796 would restore the original intent of the Hobbs Act to allow Federal authorities to prosecute union officials accused of violence or extortion in violation of the Hobbs Act. The author of the Hobbs Act, Representative Samuel Hobbs, stated, "that crime is crime * * *, whether or not the perpetrator has a union card." I agree with Mr. Hobbs, and I believe that, regardless of one's views on labor issues, the House can agree that violence is wrong and ought to be condemned. Lady Justice, after all, is blindfolded—she should not be peeking to ask for union credentials.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

HON. DOUGLAS "PETE" PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot the past several weeks about deficit reduction. And I've heard a lot about the urgent need to reform Medicare and Medicaid.

Although there is widespread agreement among nearly every Member of in this Chamber with regard to the above mentioned principles, let me remind my colleagues that Medicare cannot be saved through a simple line item on a budget bill, nor can Medicaid be reformed by simply changing it to a block grant and passing it off to the States. These ideas

have been discussed by some as the solution to all the problems that face these programs, a quick and easy resolution to the approaching crisis.

But now, strong and decisive steps are necessary to make a serious attempt at reducing the Federal budget deficit. Nevertheless, some Members of this body want to take a walk when it comes time to tackle the fastest growing segment of the Federal budget—health care. It is simply indisputable that we can never make more than a dent in the long-term budget deficit facing our children unless we seriously address reform of our health care system.

Contrary to the rhetoric that has been thrown about by defenders of the status quo, health care reform—sensible health care reform, does not mean mandates and big-government intervention. Instead, sensible health care reform means ensuring that working Americans do not have to live in fear of losing their insurance should they or a member of their family get sick or injured. It means getting a grip on the rampant cost-shifting that raises the cost of health care services for all Americans.

Unfortunately, the leadership of this House has chosen to ignore this complex issue. However, on Wednesday I and several of my colleagues introduced H.R. 2071, the Health Care Improvement Act of 1995. This bill includes many of the reforms on which we can all agree, such as insurance reform and administrative simplification. But, unlike the other incremental health care bills that have been introduced in this Congress, my bill makes long-overdue systematic changes in Medicaid by allowing low-income persons to join the private health insurance market.

My bill will also give much greater choice to Medicare beneficiaries by providing them the opportunity to join a private insurance plan. This is not a push into a low-cost, bare bones plan; it is not a push into anything. It is simply one more option for Medicare beneficiaries to choose from.

Mr. Speaker, health care reform should not be a partisan issue. I wrote this bill in an effort to craft something that could garner the support of the American people, not to simply make a political statement. This bill represents a realistic approach to health care reform, and I encourage each of my colleagues to take a close look at H.R. 2071. I think you will like what you see.

In the meantime, we should all think about whether it is better to reform Medicare and Medicaid, or simply to take a meat axe to those programs in order to fulfill an arbitrarily-set budget number. The answer is clear.

SALUTE TO BERNARDO DE
GALVEZ

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a man whose contributions helped a fledgling America gain its independence. Gen. Bernardo de Galvez, Spain's Governor of the Louisiana Territory, was extremely instrumental in helping us defeat the British in the Revolutionary War. The General personally led

troops in a successful campaign to drive the British from the Louisiana Territory and the Gulf of Mexico. His forces captured Pensacola, Baton Rouge, Mobile, San Antonio, and Galveston from the British to support America's aspirations for freedom.

The General's actions denied these posts to Great Britain and severely pressured British forces in the South. His support of America's Continental Army and militiamen through the provision of munitions, cattle, and uniforms helped to assure America's final victory.

Mr. Speaker, General de Galvez's efforts had a major impact on the war and were a key to this nation's success against the British. As we approach the anniversary of his birth on July 23rd, we as free Americans should take a moment to honor an individual who did much to secure the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness we so enjoy today.

CONGRATULATIONS DOUG BOVIN,
PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today, July 21, 1995, marks the beginning of the annual convention of the National Association of Counties in Atlanta, GA. Most of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will likely have one or more of their county officials in attendance, but this year's conference has a very special significance to the First District of Michigan, this Member and especially to one of my constituents, not to mention a friend.

Mr. Doug Bovin of Gladstone, MI, who currently serves as president of the Delta County Board of Commissioners, will be installed as president of the National Association of Counties today, Friday, July 21, 1995. I and the entire First Congressional District of Michigan salute Mr. Bovin on his new office and extend to him our best wishes for a successful term in office.

Doug Bovin has personified public service for the past 28 years. It was in 1967 that he won election to his first public office on the Gladstone City Commission. In just 2 years, he sought and won his race for mayor of the community, and is believed to be the youngest person ever elected to that position in Gladstone.

Recognized by others throughout Delta County for his leadership, understanding of public issues and ability to help people, Mr. Bovin was encouraged to seek the office of county commissioner in 1976, a position he has held for the past 19 years and the last 12 as chairman.

Over the years, Doug has broadened his leadership in several ways. He has served as president of the Michigan Association of Boards of Health and then as president of the Michigan Association of Counties in the mid-1980's. Having a firm grasp on State issues, Doug understood the importance of regional matters and the effect they had on the State and his home area. To this end, he organized the Great Lakes Association, a group of county officials from States that border the Great Lakes as well as Iowa, and served as the first association president in 1990.

Doug's work in the Great Lakes region has led to his deep involvement with the National Association of Counties where he has held three vice presidencies. He now will move to the presidency of the organization. And despite his personal and political growth, Doug has never forgotten his obligations in Delta County and has never placed the interests of his constituents above his own.

Mr. Speaker, Doug Bovin has dedicated most of his life to public service, but to his credit, has always made his family his main priority. His wife, Bonnie, and children, Carrie and Dan are very proud of Doug as are the people of Michigan's First Congressional District.

Again, our congratulations to Doug Bovin, President of the National Association of Counties.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER BLUTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 535, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following that rollcall vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 543, I ask that the RECORD reflect that I intended to vote "yes."

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE FOR
ROLLCALL VOTES NUMBERED
542, 543, 544, AND 545, RELATING
TO H.R. 1976, THE AGRICULTURE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FIS-
CAL YEAR 1996

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I regret my unavoidable absence for rollcall votes numbered 542 through 545. I was tending to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall vote No. 542, "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 543, "nay"; on rollcall vote No. 544, "aye"; on rollcall vote No. "545, "nay."

A CONSTITUENT'S VIEWS ON THE
FLAG DESECRATION AMENDMENT**HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a constituent, Mr. Geoffrey Graham of the Bronx. Mr. Graham thanked me for my vote against the proposed constitutional amendment to permit Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the U.S. flag. He also enclosed an essay expressing his views on this issue in more detail, which I thought was very eloquent. I commend this essay to my colleagues, and hope that each and every one will read it carefully and think again about the messages this amendment to our Constitution would send to residents of the United States and to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham's essay follows:

WHY I OPPOSE THE FLAG DESECRATION
AMENDMENT

There are three reasons to oppose the Constitutional amendment that would "protect" the flag.

The most important is that it will bring a small measure of fear into the lives of ordinary Americans. There are countries where people live in deep fear of their own government and institutions. Russia is a particularly tragic example, but there are many others. The contrast in quality of life between such countries and our own is so stark that any change in that direction should be viewed with apprehension.

Now, the friendly and familiar American flag, always a welcome presence, is being transformed into something that must be handled warily. It will have to be kept from young children and boisterous drunks, lest a felony occur. Unruly adolescents will have to be taught that disrespect for this object, unlike disrespect for the family bible or Crucifix, can bring severe punishment from outside the family. Idealistic teenagers, who sometimes believe in the First Amendment with almost religious fervor, will have to learn that the flag is an exception that could get them into very serious and long-lasting trouble. Housewives who are tempted to wash a soiled flag along with the regular laundry will have to remember that they had better not. We will have become a nation that is slightly afraid of its own flag.

A second reason is that it will undercut our efforts to help dissenters around the world who are being punished for violating some holy symbol. Sometimes, polite verbal protest is not enough. Most of us could sympathize with women in Islamic fundamentalist countries who might burn their veil or even a copy of the Koran. Of with women in poor Catholic countries, where the church has great influence, who might publicly destroy a Bible of crucifix in anger over the church's position on birth control. Or with inhabitants of the former U.S.S.R. or Rhodesia if they burned their hated internal passports. Or with Chinese dissidents who, following the Tiananmen Square massacre, might direct a bitter symbolic protest at China's leader Deng Xiaoping (the act is to publicly break a small bottle, a "xiao ping"). Our efforts to shield such dissenters have been moderately successful; but in the future, they will be weakened by the taint of hypocrisy. Indeed if disrespect for an icon is the important thing, rather than the form which the disrespect takes, it will be hard for us to reproach the Iranian government

for its treatment of writers like Salman Rushdie.

The third reason is that the amendment will vandalize something much more important than the flag, our Constitution which includes the Bill of Rights. The Constitution is based on an unusual principle of government: an agreement to strictly limit the ability of any group to use the machinery of government against those of whom it disapproves. To that end, it guarantees freedom of expression without concessions to powerful political interests. In particular, it provides that expressions of discontent must be harmful, rather than merely convey and offensive idea, in order to be forbidden. Now we are abrogating that principle in return for the shallowest of satisfaction.

The Constitution, not the flag, has made us the great nation that we often are. It is admired around the world, and has been imitated countless times. Along with the Magna Carta and the Geneva and Hague Conventions, it is a landmark in the human effort to treat each other with decency. It is one of the greatest secular documents ever written, but its greatness derives from the fact that we usually live up to its guiding philosophy. It deserves better than this.

There is still time for the American public to give this proposed amendment the careful scrutiny it deserves. We should.

TRIBUTE TO PARTICIPANTS OF
THE SUMMER INITIATIVE "POLICE
AND COMMUNITY TOGETHER STOP THE VIOLENCE"
RALLY/CONCERT**HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to acknowledge the efforts and accomplishments of the Cypress Hills and East New York communities. Through the hard work and determination of its residents and the local 75th Police Precincts, a "Stop the Violence" concert was recently organized on July 16, 1995. The purpose of the event was to promote and enhance positive relations between community residents and the Police Officers that serve and protect them.

Through cultural performances and other presentations, young people were exposed to an enlightening and positive atmosphere. Recognizing the limited resources available to support creative and ongoing events such as this one, I must applaud the efforts of the Police Department, community residents, and other collaborative groups for making this activity possible. It is through a collective and innovative strategy that our communities will be able to bring about positive social change. I must also acknowledge the dedication and outstanding track record of Police Officers' Richard Perez and Dennis Rivera.

I believe we must use this event as a model strategy for bridging gaps in communication within our cities and neighborhoods. We must also give praise and support to the individuals and organizations that make these activities possible. The communities of Cypress Hills and East New York have made a valuable contribution to society—an investment in our young people. Thank you.

IN MEMORIAL OF DAVID J.
WHEELER**HON. WES COOLEY**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted a bill (H.R. 2061) to name the Federal building in Baker City, OR, after the late David J. Wheeler. I rise today to offer a few words in memory of Mr. Wheeler.

Baker City is a close-knit community in eastern Oregon—a little over an hour from the Idaho border. The town, lying just east of the beautiful Blue Mountains, was deeply affected by the recent loss of David Wheeler, one of the community's best-loved citizens. Mr. Wheeler, an employee of the U.S. Forest Service, was inspecting bridges in the Payette National Forest in late April when he was brutally murdered by two teenaged thugs.

Mr. Wheeler's death has had a tremendous impact on the entire Baker City community, because he was an active civic leader involved in and committed to his adopted Oregon hometown. In 1994, Mr. Wheeler was selected by the Baker County Chamber of Commerce as the Baker County Father of the Year. At the time of his death, Mr. Wheeler was president-elect of the Baker City Rotary Club. He was a leader in the United Methodist Church, where he served as chair of the staff-parish relations committee. He served as a coach at the local YMCA and was a member of the Baker County Community Choir. The import of the above is clear, Mr. Speaker—Mr. Wheeler was a model Forest Service employee, a dedicated family man, and an admired and respected citizen.

I am honored to propose that the Federal building in Baker City be dedicated to his memory.

HELPING SCHOOLS MEET THE "DIETARY
GUIDELINES FOR AMERICANS"**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining Mr. GOODLING in bipartisan legislation—H.R. 2066—to give schools more flexibility in the methods they may choose to improve the quality of their meals and to meet the dietary recommendations in the "Dietary Guidelines for Americans," including the appropriate levels of recommended dietary allowance for nutrients and energy. I stand firm in my support for improving the nutritional value of school meals and for the legislation passed last year requiring schools to meet the guidelines in the time line indicated in Public Law 103-448.

In last year's reauthorization of the National School Lunch Act, Democrats and Republicans joined together to support the "Dietary Guidelines for Americans." Our goal was, and is, for the school lunch program to provide healthy meals that kids will eat. The reauthorization bill—Public Law 103-448—requires schools to bring their meals into compliance by the first day of the 1996-97 school year.

Because this time line is relatively short, we sought to give schools flexibility in the methods from which they might choose to reach compliance.

The regulations interpreting the new law, however, do not provide the flexibility we sought. Unfortunately, the regulations prohibit schools able to comply with the guidelines under the current meal pattern, or another nutritionally sound meal pattern, from doing so. In fact, those already in compliance under the current meal pattern would be forced to change to one of USDA's new systems even though they are already in compliance with the guidelines.

Though studies have shown that most schools do not meet the guidelines under the current meal pattern, some schools are able to. Others believe they could meet the guidelines also if they make a few minor changes in cooking methods and food choices. I do not believe schools that are able to meet the guidelines under the current meal pattern or another nutritionally sound meal pattern should be precluded from using those systems. Our goal is to provide healthier meals, not to ensure certain methods are used for achieving healthier meals. Specifically this legislation allows schools to use any reasonable method to meet the guidelines, including those provided by USDA.

The Clinton administration deserves great credit for working to improve the health of schoolchildren. This amendment is in keeping with that effort. Our bill says to schools: We don't care what method you use to provide your children healthy, nutritionally balanced meals, just make sure you get it done.

I firmly believe that the problems posed by the inflexibility of the USDA regulations can be corrected by the Secretary, and there will be no need to go forward with the bill. Again, I commend the administration for its work in this area and look forward to continuing our bipartisan effort to improve the nutritional value of school meals.

CHINA POLICY ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2058. I want to commend the efforts of my good friends Ms. PELOSI and Mr. WOLF against the human rights atrocities in China.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has granted MFN renewal to China annually since 1980. Since the massacre in Tiananmen Square in 1989, we have been extremely focused on China's human rights performance. There are some Members who de-link international trade and human rights and believe that the infusion of Western business practices and ideas will lead to greater freedom in China.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 6 years since the Chinese regime directed the brutal massacre of pro-democracy protesters in Tiananmen Square. There has been little change, at best, in the dismal human rights record of the Chinese government.

There still has not been a full accounting for the victims of the 1989 crackdown. And, fur-

thermore, just 2 months ago, scores of well-known activists and intellectuals were rounded up and arrested for filing open petitions to the government urging a complete list of those who died.

Over the past 2 years this Congress has been, in my opinion, lenient towards the continued denials of freedom of expression, association, and religion in China.

Clearly, the time has come to send a clear and strong message to President Zemin and the National People's Congress that the United States will no longer stand idly by as products are made by slave labor for export, dissidents are permanently exiled, and torture and denial of medical care continues in Chinese prisons and labor camps.

The bill before us clearly states the Congress' outrage at China's violation of international nonproliferation standards. It also calls upon China to respect and uphold the U.N. Charter and universal declaration of human rights.

Despite previous concessions and promises made by the Chinese regime on human rights, the State Department recently reported that there continues to be widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in China.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear * * * I agree that we must engage the Chinese. I recognize the over \$9 billion of exports to China last year and the thousands of American jobs associated with those products and services.

However, we should not help underwrite the totalitarian regime in China any longer. This MFN debate is very different than others in the past.

This is a hallmark moment in United States-Sino relations. The post-Deng Xiaoping transition period approaches. With the fall of the Soviet Union, the Korean peninsula has become the most dangerous place on the planet.

As we have learned in country after country in Europe, the United States develops its strongest alliances and ensures its lasting security when we stand firmly and unequivocally for the principles upon which our own Nation was founded.

Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, the fact is that MFN is the only bargaining power we have with the Chinese each year. Our continued policy of unconditional engagement and economic stimulus to encourage human rights and nuclear nonproliferation is a failed policy.

H.R. 2058 directs the President to undertake intensified diplomatic initiatives to persuade the Chinese Government to, among other things, adhere to prevailing international standards regarding nonproliferation of weapons and respect the internationally recognized human rights of its citizens.

These initiatives will be carried out in our bilateral relations with China, and through the United Nations, the World Bank, and the WTO.

This bill requires the administration to report every 6 months on the progress of these initiatives and the Chinese Government's willingness to bring about reform.

Essentially, this bill will not allow the administration to walk away from the reality of the human rights abuses or nuclear proliferation.

It will also require the Chinese to make real reforms now, rather than empty and worthless concessions days before MFN renewal each year.

Mr. Speaker, there is a general consensus in the Congress that the best China policy is

one that advocates a prosperous, strong, and democratic China. This bill is a compromise which makes great strides toward effectively pressuring the Chinese to make needed reforms, while not denying MFN status to China at this time. For that reason, I will support this bill. Thank you.

JUSTICE WARREN BURGER

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, our friend, Warren Cikins, has written a predictably eloquent piece for *Legal Times* about Justice Warren Burger.

I am pleased to share it with all those members and scholars who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WARREN BURGER'S QUEST FOR "FACTORIES WITH FENCES"

(By Warren Cikins)

Much is being written of Chief Justice Warren Burger's commitment to strengthening the criminal Justice system and to ensuring the punishment of wrongdoers, but the occasion of his death at 87 on June 25, should also be an opportunity to highlight his determination to give offenders a chance to reform. As he proclaimed in a 1981 speech, "When society places a person behind walls and bars it is an obligation—a moral obligation—to do whatever can reasonably be done to change that person before he or she goes back into the stream of society."

Burger's commitment to prison reform was part of his broader interest in improving the administration of justice. The number and breadth of his contributions are themselves remarkable. In "The Politics of Judicial Reform" (1982), Burger's early endeavors are described by Dr. Mark Cannon, who held the position of administrative assistant to the chief justice from 1972 to 1986—a position Burger helped create to facilitate these reforms. Cannon chronicles Burger's joint efforts with the American Bar Association to create the Institute of Judicial Administration, his support of the interbranch Hruska Commission created in 1972 and continuing operations until 1975), his expansion of the functions of the Administrative Office of the Courts, his work with the Department of Justice to create the position of assistant attorney general for the Office for the Improvements in the Administration of Justice, and the greater involvement by the Judicial Conference of the United States (which he headed as chief justice) in the preparation of data necessary for legislation of major significance to the judiciary.

Burger also sponsored the National center for State Courts at Williamsburg, Va., supported the creation of the Federal Judicial Center (a brainchild of his colleague, Justice Tom Clark), promoted the National College of the Judiciary in Reno, Nev., helped create the State-Justice Institute, and sponsored the creation of the National Institute of Corrections and the National Corrections Academy in Boulder, Colo.

At his urging, the Brookings Institution sponsored a series of annual seminars that began in 1978 and continued through 1993. Attendees included the chief justice, the attorney general, the chairman and other members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and numerous other jurists and

senior Justice Department officials. As Burger noted in 1983, at these seminars, "the topics range from subjects as old as federal jurisdiction, to subjects as new as the impact of automation on the judicial process."

These seminars were more than theoretical discussions. As Burger stated, "Many proposals considered at Williamsburg have been enacted by Congress. They include the division of the 5th Circuit, the creation of the Court of International Trade, the merger of the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals into the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the passage of the Omnibus Judgeship Act of 1978 and the Dispute Resolution Act, the relaxation of Speedy Trial Act time limits, improved juror protection and compensation, and clarification and expansion of magistrate jurisdiction."

As these extensive and varied efforts demonstrate, Chief Justice Burger was deeply committed to fostering cooperation between the three branches of the federal government to improve the administration of justice.

Burger's thoughts on prison reform began to form even in his childhood. In a foreword to a 1993 book, "Privatizing Corrections Institutions," he wrote, "I remember a visit as a Boy Scout to the Stillwater prison where some inmates were indeed 'warehoused' even though Minnesota was a pioneer in prison production."

As chief justice, he continued his work on this issue, which he characterized in a 1981 speech as a choice between "more warehouses or factories with fences."

Burger's efforts on behalf of meaningful corrections reform ranged from appearing on Ted Koppel's "Nightline" to taking a distinguished group of Americans to Scandinavia to observe prison industries. Lloyd Elliott, then president of George Washington University, agreed to create a Center on Innovations in Corrections. An advisory board of senior government officials and representatives for the private sector was assembled to assist the center's director, Dr. Judith Schloegel. Job-training projects were identified to be implemented at the state level.

These efforts spawned the creation of the National Task Force on Prison Industries. Chaired by Frank Considine, president of the National Can Corp., this group included other prominent business leaders, criminologists, and senior government officials from all three branches of the federal government.

The task force helped create a national climate of acceptance for prison industries. This was (and continues to be) an especially sensitive issue, since inmate production engenders valid concerns about competition with nonprison workers.

A high-water mark of Burger's prison industries effort was a 1985 conference at Wingspread, in Racine, Wis. Participants considered the full range of legal and practical issues, including management, procurement, marketing, inmate compensation, staff and inmate training, job placement, business and labor concerns, research and evaluation, and media and public relations. Particular attention was given to controlling prison costs and to the establishment of programs designed to help inmates defray some of the costs of incarceration.

Among the representatives from private industry, corrections, legislatures, universities, and the public were a number of co-operating business people, some of whom went on to create or run prison-industry programs. For example, the Control Data Corp. set up a computer assembly plant in the Stillwater, Minn., prison and promised inmate workers jobs when they were released: Jack Eckerd of the Florida drugstore chain, Eckerd Stores, later took over on a private basis the job-placement effort for Florida state inmates.

When Chief Justice Burger retired from the Supreme Court in 1986 to give full-time attention to his job as chairman of the Bicentennial Commission, he put his involvement in prison industries on the back burner. By the early 1990s, however, he was back in the fray, when he took up the cause of UNICOR, the federal prison-industry program created by Congress in 1934 to provide job training in federal prisons, paid for by products made by inmates.

The House of Representatives had adopted an amendment to the 1990 crime bill that would sharply restrict UNICOR in four key areas: furniture, textiles, apparel, and footwear. While this proposal was in conference—and appeared about to be adopted—Chief Justice Burger went into action.

As *The Washington Post* front-page story of Nov. 12, 1990 reported, "Burger fired off letters to House and Senate conferees labeling it an 'astonishing proposal' that would be 'an incredible setback to one of the most enlightened aspects of the federal prison system.'" Conferee Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) told his colleagues that he would not accept the anti-UNICOR amendment, and that ended the matter.

MIDDLE GROUND

Burger lent his considerable energies to efforts to find a middle ground between the federal government and adversely affected industries and labor unions. He revived the Prison Industries Task Force, and prevailed upon former Attorney General Griffin Bell (and later, the former head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency, Judge William Webster) to serve as chairman of that group. In his January 1994 address to the task force, Burger cited the Scandinavian governments as role models for recognizing that most incarcerated individuals eventually return to society and therefore should be made literate and trained in meaningful jobs. "The U.S. needs to focus on education, training, and work to try to make offenders better people than when they entered the system," he urged.

Burger rejected the notion that his views on prison reform were at odds with his law-and-order approach to criminal justice. As the *Post* quoted Burger as saying, "My position on this is the most conservative one you can imagine. If you can take an individual and train him so he can do something a little more useful than stamping license plates, he's a little less likely to go back [into prison]. This isn't for the benefit of the criminal community. It's for the benefit of you and me."

Chief Justice Warren Burger continued his commitment to prison industries until the end of his life. In this quest for inmate rehabilitation, Warren Earl Burger honored his country.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LENORE DONNELLY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today we say farewell to Mrs. Lenore (Lenny) Donnelly, chief of democratic pages, who is retiring after 10 years of dedicated service in this position. She will be sorely missed.

Mrs. Donnelly's career in politics spans three decades and is quite impressive. She knew and worked with two great Democratic Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B.

Johnson. She campaigned for President Kennedy and served President Johnson in the White House. She also worked for Senator Robert F. Kennedy. In 1985, she was appointed Chief of Democratic Pages by Speaker Thomas "Tip" O'Neill.

Mrs. Donnelly has been a valuable asset to this institution. She has trained and counseled more than 2,000 pages from across the country. Her contributions helped to make the page program a highly productive experience for the young men and women who participated.

I want to express my deep gratitude to Mrs. Donnelly for her outstanding assistance and wish her much success and great fellowship in the future.

REMEMBRANCE OF RICK NEUSTADT

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Democratic Party lost a creative voice and I lost a good friend.

Rick Neustadt and I met in the Carter White House, where his keen policy instincts were extremely valuable. He then moved to the private sector where he used his knowledge of communications policy to help fledgling new communications technologies to develop. He did good—and he did well.

He also continued his interest in refining and refocusing the Democratic Party to understand new technologies and the new workforce. His ideas were central to an excellent publication by the Democratic Leadership Council in California.

I learned a lot from Rick, and was hopeful he would play an increasingly prominent role in the DLC and the definition of the new Democrat. His untimely death in a rafting accident is a major loss to his friends, his party, and his country.

COMMEMORATING 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BELVIDERE, NEW JERSEY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the 150th anniversary of the founding at Belvidere, NJ. The residents of Belvidere will hold a parade tomorrow as one of several events in a year-long celebration that began with a New Year's Eve party December 31. There have also been a costume ball, a charter signing re-enactment and a family fishing day. Obviously, there's so much to Belvidere's proud history that it cannot all be celebrated in just one day or just one event.

Belvidere was officially founded in 1845. But its history goes back to at least 1716, when William Penn and his partner, Colonel John Alford, purchased what was then the Lenape Indian village of Pequase. The property covered both sides of the Pequest River. The line

dividing the Penn and Alford properties became a colonial road that is now known as Route 519.

Many historical events have happened since then in Belvidere. Belvidere has had roles to play in the French and Indian Wars, the American Revolution and the Industrial Revolution, just to name a few of its places in history.

Belvidere was founded largely because of its location at the confluence of the Delaware and Pequest Rivers. The rivers first attracted Indian villages, then 18th century settlers and made possible 19th century mills. Since 1824, Belvidere has been the county seat of Warren County and continues to be the focus of the county.

I'd like to mention some of the past residents of Belvidere who contributed to the town's heritage in ways that should not be forgotten:

Robert Patterson, a tinsmith who purchased land along the Pequest from William Penn in 1759, Patterson's wife had been killed and scalped by Indians in Pennsylvania during the French and Indian War and brought his son to New Jersey to escape the violence. Patterson's log house still stands as Warren Lodge 13 of the Free and Accepted Masons at the corner of Front and Greenwich Streets.

David Brainerd, a 26-year-old Presbyterian minister who came to Belvidere in 1744 to preach Christianity to the Indians. Brainerd was dying of tuberculosis but spent the remaining 3 years of his life at his work. Brainerd translated a number of prayers and Psalms into the Indians' language. In addition, he kept a journal and wrote several reports on the lives of both the local Indians and settlers, which are still of immense historical value today.

Robert Hoops, who in 1769 purchased 500 acres of land from Patterson and William Penn, giving him water rights to both sides of the Pequest. These water rights made possible the industrialization of Belvidere through a saw mill, grist mill, and small factories. When the industries began to thrive on both sides of the river, Hoops linked them with the first bridge across the Pequest.

Captain John Craig, who opened the American House tavern-stagecoach stop at 322 Market Street. During the Revolutionary War, it was Captain Craig who helped reveal the British Army's plan of attack on General George Washington's army as it retreated to Valley Forge in 1777.

There are many others, of course, who contributed to Belvidere's history. I cite these as only a few examples of the wealth of history in a small town that might easily be overlooked by the pages of history books.

At only 1.25 square miles and 2,600 residents, Belvidere is the smallest municipality in the county. But its importance in our county's history obviously goes far beyond its size. I congratulate Belvidere on its history and accomplishments, and wish all the people of Belvidere as equal amount of success in the town's future.

SALUTE TO AMANDA SZALASNY

HON. MICHAEL R. McNULTY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I salute an outstanding young woman from my congressional district, Amanda Szalasny. Amanda was recently awarded first place in the essay contest, "What the American Flag Means to Me," sponsored by the Legnard-Curtin American Legion post, which is located in Green Island, NY.

The American Legion has long supported efforts to educate young people about the flag and what it means to all Americans. Amanda Szalasny's essay reflects the values that the American Legion has always promoted.

WHAT THE U.S. FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Amanda M. Szalasny)

To me the U.S. flag means liberty and independence. It is one of the most important things in all Americans lives. In the following paragraph, you will find out why I feel this way.

In 1777, the Continental Congress adopted a 13 star and stripe flag. This was a symbol of freedom, liberty, and independence of the United States. I think this flag is very important to all of us because without it, someone could overpower us easily. We wouldn't have the liberty or independence we do now. So many times, we see the flag and we don't even stop to think about how important it is to us. We barely give it the slightest glance. It is not only a piece of fabric, it is a symbol of our freedom and independence. We don't think about what we'd be without it. The flag should be looked at with respect and loyalty. So many times we hear the Star Spangled Banner and say the Pledge of Allegiance without thinking about what we're hearing or saying. What ever happened to the patriotism we used to show for our flag? Now we just hear the Star Spangled Banner and we don't even bother to really listen to this music or look at the flag as we hear it. We say the Pledge of Allegiance without that patriotism in our voice. We have to realize what these things all mean, and treat them with respect. I think our flag should be appreciated by everyone. I appreciate it and try to show the best patriotism I possibly can when I say the Pledge of Allegiance or hear the Star Spangled Banner. And most of all, when I look at our U.S. flag, I don't see just a piece of decorated fabric. I see a symbol of liberty, independence, and my country! I feel that if I do this, maybe others will follow.

In conclusion, I feel that our flag should be treated better because of all it represents. It represents us and I hope that patriotism for our flag will be shown more. Remember what it does for us.

GROUP PREFERENCES

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, once again President Clinton's propensity for waffling has gotten the best of him. It was only a few months ago that he signaled serious reform of affirmative action was essential. Now, he supports the antiquated system of racial spoils that the American public no longer supports.

Thirty years ago, the civil rights movement began to ensure America's most fundamental ideals—individual liberty and equal justice under the law. Thirty years later, however, radical liberals have distorted the law and instituted quotas and set-asides. This amounts to nothing less than reverse discrimination.

My Republican colleagues and I are committed to fashioning legislation which will create real opportunities for those who need them most. I strongly believe that achievement does not come from heavy handed bureaucratic regulations or preferential treatment, but through equal opportunity and individual effort.

Mr. Speaker, I would warn President Clinton that the policies of the past are as divisive as the policies they sought to remedy. Last November the American people voted for change. His decision to support the status quo is a direct affront to their wishes.

FUNDING OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring up a matter which deeply troubles me. The House recently passed its version of the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations bill, H.R. 1977. In its deliberations many vital programs had to be prioritized and some were eliminated or reduced drastically. During those deliberations, there was no mention of the elimination of construction funding in the Smithsonian request for the National Museum of the American Indian Cultural Resources Center.

Let me explain why this facility is so important to Indian people. First, the collection, which was transferred to the Smithsonian in 1989 from the Heye Foundation in New York, is one of the finest collections of native American treasures in existence and a legacy for the future. Without adequate protection, these treasures could be lost forever. The principal reason for the original transfer of the collection was the dismal condition of the storage facility in New York. The New York building, where most of the collection is housed, is over 70 years old and in such poor condition that it places the collection in physical danger. The Smithsonian has made the transfer of the collection out of the New York facility and into the Cultural Resources Center one of its top priorities. There is no question that the transfer is necessary in order to protect this magnificent collection.

Second, and more importantly, the establishment and progress of the National Museum of the American Indian is a fulfillment of the promises that this Congress made to the Indian tribes. Although the Cultural Resources Center will house over 1 million native American objects it will also serve as a institution of living culture, and will provide training programs, research opportunities, and educational endeavors to native peoples. This will enable Indian people to preserve and maintain their unique culture and community.

In fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated \$19.4 million in start-up moneys for the Cultural Resources Center. For fiscal year 1996, however, the House did not provide any funds

for the Center in its fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriation bill. It is my hope, and the hope of all of Indian country, that the Senate in its deliberations on the appropriations measure will see fit to restore funding for this project.

Mr. Speaker, the authority legislation for the National Museum of the American Indian created a solemn and historic obligation on behalf of this Nation to provide a living museum for its native American tribes. We should act in good faith and keep those promises, by recognizing the contributions and cultures of the native peoples who inhabited these lands first and who constitute such an integral and important thread in the fabric of our national cultural heritage. The National Museum of the American Indian Cultural Resources Center deserves our support and funding.

OPPOSING THE LANGUAGE OF HATE

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, those of us in politics have lately gotten a bad rap—people think that those of us who represent our neighbors here in Washington are craven and will say anything, stoop to any reprehensible stunt, to attract contributions and votes.

Of course, that's not true. Most Members of Congress are honorable people who are dedicated to public service.

It gets a bit hard to defend this institution when you have to pick up your morning paper and see reprehensible and hateful trash like the latest wanted poster sent out by Republican fundraisers.

Of the many Members of this body who have taken a principled stand against the Contract on America, the whiz kids decided they would push the emotional hot buttons of potential contributors if they depicted the opposition as predominantly Jewish, African-American, Latino, and female.

To which direct mail list was this to be sent? The KKK? Isn't our country divided enough without some craven politician stirring the pot in search of contributions?

One more thing, I was left off this poster and I wish to object. I have worked as hard as anyone to stop the contract's multiple assaults on individual liberty, the environment, consumers, and the Constitution. Yet this wanted poster suggests that I haven't been on the job, or worse yet, have colluded with the contract.

Mr. Speaker, where do I go to get my good name back?

PERSONAL STATEMENT

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1995, during consideration of H.R. 2020, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996, my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD state that I had planned to support this legislation on final passage. However, due

to the adoption by the House of the amendment regarding the exchange stabilization fund, I did not support this bill.

I took this regrettable action because this legislation was so dramatically altered by this amendment that if signed into law would have a negative impact on the Mexican economy. As you know, my congressional district is highly dependent on trade with Mexico.

I nevertheless plan to deal with this matter in conference to craft a bill which I hope I can support.

FAMILY VALUES FOUND ON THE FRONT PORCH

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the pastor of my local parish in Chicago, the Rev. Marcel J. Pasciak. He writes a weekly column in our parish guide entitled "Father Marc's Markings." I found Father Marc's column of July 16, 1995, to be very informative, enjoyable, inspirational, and very much needed in today's society. I think so much of his words that I wish to share them with all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Following is Father Marc's Markings:

FRONT PORCH PEOPLE

We're just not front porch people anymore. In the old neighborhood of Brighton Park, Back of the Yards, and Canaryville, when the temperature reached 80 degrees, families took to the front porch or front stoop. Chairs, stools, pillows, made their way outside as Dad read the paper, Mom knitted or crocheted and Junior with his friends played CLUE or SORRY (Monopoly money blew around too easily in the wind).

Neighbors cradling brown parcels hurrying home from the corner grocery store stopped to exchange greetings and swap stories. People from other porches down the street meandered over to say "hello" or check on the White Sox score. Ladies exchanged gardening tips; men boasted about their new lawn mowers or tools; children either drank cans of Pepsi or hurriedly unwrapped popsicles. Tugging on their mother's aprons, they pleaded for one last bicycle ride around the block before it gets too dark. "The Front Porch" meant family and neighborhood. It reflected a less complicated, more innocent lifestyle in America. The front porch was not only a place to cool off on a hot summer night; but a place where community began, where different ages mixed together, laughing, talking, sipping cool drinks. Relationships were deepened and values were communicated—it was in a sense a holy place.

In our air-conditioned society of 1995, we no longer come out on the stoop to see our neighbors or share board games with the youngsters. We huddle in front of our cable televisions or VCR's with remote control units poised in hand. We don't even huddle together since just about everyone on the household has their own television set. Table games have been replaced by computers or by video games (Nintendo or Sega * * * some quite violent). Children no longer feel energetic enough to ride their bicycles or play catch with Dad in the back yard.

Moms, tired from shopping in the large suburban malls, catch up with laundry or do housework in the evenings; many have put in a full day at work and just don't feel sociable. Dads may still tinker in the garage or

basement workshops—before couching down with beer and snackies before the television set ready for a long evening before the tube (watching sports or the newest Bruce Willis movie). No room for the front porch here.

Yes—times have changed. We no longer have that front porch mentality. No amount of politicians like Robert Dole who promote family values or clergymen inviting church participation or civic leaders calling for neighborhood pride will bring back that front porch stoop and all that it stood for.

What we do need to do is to re-invent or re-translate the front porch spirit of family and neighborhood pride in contemporary terms, in a livable way for our modern society. We need to encourage first of all, neighbors to communicate with their neighbors. In my rounds on house blessings so far, one thing that comes out strongly is the real horror stories of neighbors who live next to one another and refuse to even talk to each other. Incidents of long ago have contributed to a state of co-existence or cold war on both sides of the back yard fences.

Second, why not promote more block parties like so many blocks have each year. Barricade the street, play some music, organize some games, barbecue some food, and invite absolutely everyone to it. Invite the parish priests; maybe have a prayer service or Mass. Talk, play, and pray together.

Third, welcome newcomers who move into the neighborhood. Bring over a cake or some cold drinks and introduce yourself; it sounds corny but, you know, it breaks the ice and builds community.

Fourth, find out who might need some extra help on the block: food shopping, grass cutting, reading the newspaper for, or just sitting with. Encourage your youngsters and teens to assist in a sense of Christian service (no money accepted, please).

Fifth, provide for the safety of the neighborhood. Keep your eyes and ears open for trouble or suspicious activity. Attend police beat meetings to get to know your police officer and what you can do to keep your block safe. Work together and dialogue with neighborhoods to make your block a better place to live.

Sixth, promote this spirit in your own home. Meet your children's friends; invite them over for dinner or pizza. Invite their parents over as well. Plan common activities or trips to Great America or baseball games or to the water park. Do creative tournaments or games in your back yard or front lawn to instill healthy competition (bingo games, chess, stick ball, board games). Encourage your children to walk or bike around the neighborhood, instead of always relying on the automobile to get us around town.

We need desperately to come out of our shells, out of our homes, we need to network and communicate and realize that we depend on one another. We need to rediscover that it's people that makes the world go round—not computers or television images—real live people communicating, laughing, playing, living together. Our stories of faith and life must be filled with memories not of video games and cable movies but of people and neighborhoods and porch stoops.

A TRIBUTE TO MARILYN LEFTWICH

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, from the third

congressional district of West Virginia, Ms. Marilyn Leftwich, an extraordinary employee of the Federal Prison Camp in Alderson, WV. Upon her retirement on August 31, 1995, Ms. Leftwich will have completed almost 25 years of service. Throughout her career, she has been a professional role model for the staff, and has had a great impact on the various programs at Alderson Federal Prison Camp.

Ms. Leftwich received her bachelor's degree at Bluefield State College, in Bluefield, WV, and her master's degree at Liberty University, during a career which began in 1970. Starting as a correctional officer, she was soon promoted to correctional counselor, community programs coordinator, and eventually to her current position as unit manager. Besides her accomplishments at work, Ms. Leftwich has raised a family of three children, and has been very active in the community, and her church. She has also received a number of awards for her work and dedication to the community and her job, some of which include the Outstanding Achievement Award, Employee of the Month, and Outstanding Performance Appraisal Awards. Active in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], and in the development of the Alderson Federal Prison Camp Affirmative Action Program, Ms. Leftwich will long be remembered for her hard work to establish equality in all realms of society. Her involvement in community programs like these, has helped the Federal Prison Camp build and maintain a sound relationship with the surrounding community, as well as having a great impact in the attempt of creating a diverse work force.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Leftwich's dedication throughout the years has been vital in developing community project for the Prison Camp, including a program in which inmates donate clothing for needy families in the community. She helped to organize a group of inmates to maintain a section of the highway under the Adopt a Highway program. Her most recent project was called "Mothers and Infants Together," which allows for pregnant inmate mothers to bond with their newborn babies for a period of 3 months.

At a time when there has been so much focus on reducing government spending, we should appreciate the many programs which Ms. Leftwich developed and supervised. A shining example is the institution sewing room, which has saved the government money by producing maternity clothing and reupholstering services, sewing drapes and other items, while at the same time providing meaningful employment for the inmate workers.

We must commend Ms. Leftwich on her effort to include the inmates into as many projects as possible. These projects served both the inmates and the community, which is an ideal way to let the public know that the inmates should not be forgotten members of society.

Ms. Leftwich's retirement will bring a great void to the staff at the Federal Prison Camp in Alderson, WV. After she retires, Ms. Leftwich plans to continue her community service and council children. She is an extraordinary woman, who has had a great impact of the female inmates and the community of Alderson, WV over the years.

UNITED STATES COOPERATION
WITH THE INTERNATIONAL
PARTNERS, INCLUDING RUSSIA,
IN THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE
STATION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the international space station program. The first phase of this, the most challenging international technological project ever attempted, has already started with the space shuttle missions to Mir, the space station that has been operated by Russia for over 8 years. Just a few weeks ago, NASA and the Russian Space Agency demonstrated that joint operations in space are possible as the crew of *Atlantis* docked with Mir and became the largest, and most populated, spacecraft to ever orbit the Earth with its combined crew of 10. It was a flawless mission that provided our scientists with the opportunity to study the effect of long-duration space travel on one of our own astronauts and, for the first time, on two cosmonauts.

Conducting these joint operations and joint scientific experiments on the shuttle/Mir aboard Mir teaches our two space agencies to work together. This provides valuable experience and test data that will greatly reduce the risk during assembly and operation of the international space station. Conducting scientific experiments aboard Mir also gives our researchers the opportunity to benefit from long-term space flight—something not currently available on shuttle flights that only average about 10 days' duration.

By incorporating Russia into the partnership, space station construction costs to the United States are reportedly decreased by about \$2 billion overall, and it will be completed at least 15 months sooner than planned before Russia's inclusion. The Russian partnership will allow America to tap into the Russians' vast experience. Russians have nearly three times more time in orbit than Americans.

But more importantly, as democracies the world over now face many difficult situations, we can look to the international space station program as the preeminent example of just how much we can accomplish when former adversaries work with each other, not against each other.

SALUTE TO CAROL JENIFER,
DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF THE INS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, given that we are so frequently confronted with the troubles and the travails of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, I would like to have the following uplifting article inserted in the RECORD. The article profiles Carol Jenifer, the first African-American woman to manage day-to-day operations in an INS district office. Ms. Jenifer is the District Director of the INS district office at the United States-Canada border located in my hometown of Detroit, MI. I hope and ex-

pect that the INS will continue to attract and promote individuals of Ms. Jenifer's caliber.

CAN BUSINESS STILL SURVIVE IN OUR CITIES?

(By Anita Lienert)

Carol Jenifer does not look like a huggable person. She wears her hair in a Marine Corps-style buzz cut and shuns makeup and jewelry. Although she's six feet tall, she seems even taller, carrying herself with a military bearing that reflects her years as a police officer in Washington, D.C. She carries a gold badge that says "District Director" and has just ordered a Glock handgun to keep in her desk. To get inside her office at the U.S.-Canada border in Detroit, you need to get by a metal detector and armed employees.

So when one of her clients leaps out of a seat in the waiting room at the Detroit branch of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and gives Jenifer a big hug, it seems somewhat out of place.

"Oh, Miss Jenifer," says Chadia Haidous, a Lebanese immigrant. "I just got sworn in today! I'm an American citizen! And now I don't have to worry about my daughter."

Jenifer, 45, the first African-American woman to manage day-to-day operations at one of the 33 INS district offices in the United States, hugs her back and rejoices with the Haidous family.

Moments later, loping up the back steps to her office that overlooks the Detroit River, Jenifer explains that little Alica Haidous, 11, who was born in Senegal, could have faced deportation because her mother was not a U.S. citizen.

"The family was afraid the daughter would have to go back to Senegal unescorted," Jenifer explains. "I could have stuck to the book, but why? I made a heart decision and I made it in the name of family unity. I could have sent her back and had them petition for her, but I didn't. And now it won't happen because we don't treat our citizens like that."

Jenifer, who oversees a hectic operation with a \$14 million annual budget, considers herself one of the new breed of INS managers. While the southern border with Mexico draws most of the media attention, INS officials say the northern border has its share of illegal immigrants—they just don't talk about how many.

Therefore, it's her mission to walk a tightrope to satisfy a number of different constituents, from American taxpayers who are disturbed by the large number of illegal aliens entering the country, to immigrants who complain about long lines and insensitive treatment at INS offices.

One of Jenifer's first management decisions was to improve the atmosphere by installing brighter lights in the crowded waiting room. She is considering hiring a customer-service representative to handle complaints generated by the 48 million people who pass through INS checkpoints in her jurisdiction each year, including the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel, the Ambassador Bridge and Detroit Metropolitan Airport. She is also determined to hire an inspector who is fluent in Arabic because her client base is 50 percent Middle Eastern and no one in the office is fluent in that language.

Jenifer has made it a point to get to know the names—and personal details—of the 254 employees and one drug-sniffing dog who work with her in patrolling eight ports of entry along 804 miles of water boundary between the United States and Canada.

So far, one of Jenifer's "employee" relations challenges has been communicating with the German shepherd: Gitta only responds to commands in German. Even so, Jenifer still knows how to work a room—whether it's full of customers or employees—

in a charismatic style reminiscent of Ronald Reagan. She stops often to ask about sick wives or new husbands. But don't confuse her familiarity and warm-and-fuzzy approach with wimpiness. In reality, her management style is much close to the tenets of Tough Love.

After all, her office deported 1,249 people in 1994. And shortly after the heartwarming scene with the Haidous family, Jenifer stands firm on a \$15,000 bond set by her deputy director earlier in the afternoon on a Jordanian immigrant whose wife had blurted out during his naturalization interview that she had been "paid to marry him." He also had prior felon convictions and there was an outstanding warrant for his arrest.

But to get a real feel for Jenifer, you need to see her in action at 7:30 a.m., as a single parent in Detroit getting her two daughters, Eboni and Kia, both 13 off to school. Jenifer skips breakfast and barks orders like "Kia, did you finish those dishes?" and "Eboni, give me that assignment notebook to sign."

While her girls scurry around, Jenifer straightens her simple black dress, snaps on a beeper and bundles up in a coat and scarf, stopping only to grab her ever-present black leather organizer.

Outside, it's 20 degrees and still dark, with a light snowfall. Sounding like a typical mother, Jenifer grumbles that she can't get the girls to wear their ski caps to school and that they keep pestering her to buy a dog.

"When I applied for the job a year ago, I told my supervisors that the girls were a huge part of my life," Jenifer says in the car on the way to work. "I told them I would have to limit travel because I attend games, go to parent conferences and pick them up after school. It didn't seem to hurt, because I think they wanted someone who could humanize the office."

At work, her office is decorated with striking paintings of "buffalo soldiers"—the all-black cavalry who fought and resettled the West. Jenifer explains that since taking the job last spring, she has been worried about every little detail, including whether or not she should have hung the artwork.

"I almost took the pictures down," she says. "I didn't want to overwhelm people who couldn't relate to something like that. But after I thought about it, I realized I needed those men [in the pictures] to watch my back. Management has some pitfalls."

In private, Jenifer admits that "being a tall black female has had its problems."

Testifying before a congressional committee last fall on equal employment opportunity protection and employment practices at the INS, she described the low points of her career, beginning with her job interview 12 years ago for an INS analyst position.

"The interviewer seemed more surprised that I was articulate and a product of the D.C. public school system than in other qualifying factors," Jenifer told the committee. "It was quite obvious that I did not fit whatever image this manager had regarding African-Americans. He later remarked that one day I would be his 'boss' . . . There remains a perception that my advancement was due to connections and not based on merit."

She says she had to struggle for every promotion at the federal agency, at one point hiring an attorney to present her concerns about lack of advancement to INS personnel officials.

Despite those early challenges, Jenifer says the transition to her new \$88,000-a-year position has been relatively smooth, due in part to her long INS experience that ranges from working as an officer in the detention-and-deportation branch to holding the post of second-in-command in Detroit before she got the director's job. Her boss, Carol

Chasse, INS eastern region director, describes Jenifer as "a shining star."

"She's got it," Chasse says. "She's a practitioner of good human relations. Leadership in the '90s is about people skills and that's critical here because we deal with huge volumes of people."

Although Jenifer grew up in Washington, D.C., she never dreamed of working for the INS. The daughter of a bookbinder at the Federal Bureau of Engraving wanted to be a firefighter. "But back in those days, women didn't get to be firefighters," she says. "I had to settle for police work." Her time on the D.C. force included a stint undercover on the prostitution detail.

Jenifer later earned two master's degrees, one is counseling from the University of the District of Columbia and one in public administration from Southeastern University. She said the degrees helped her develop the discipline to manage efficiently.

The first order of almost every day is meeting with her top managers. Six out of seven of Jenifer's managers are women, which is notable considering there are no female border patrol chiefs in the United States and there are only two female district directors. On the day of the interview, Jenifer seems to be running late for the daily briefing, until she explains that she sets her office clock 15 minutes fast on purpose. She grabs a piece of hard candy from the jar on her desk and heads out right on time.

The meeting is fast-paced and informal, and covers topics ranging from the need for air fresheners in the office bathrooms to a video for employees about avoiding sexual harassment. Jenifer insists that her managers keep their remarks to a minimum, and they give their daily reports in a sort of verbal shorthand that takes a total of 21 minutes.

"E-mail is negative," begins administrative officer Judy McCormack.

"No arrests yesterday," pipes up James Wellman, acting assistant district director for investigations.

The issue of bathroom air fresheners prompts some discussion. "I don't care what you get, as long as we get them in there," she says to her staff, slightly annoyed after being questioned about what type should be ordered.

Jenifer is anxious to end the meeting and get down into the public waiting room for her daily "walk around" with people who are here to take citizenship tests, file paperwork contesting deportations or apply for green cards. Although she speaks English only, she communicates well, sometimes with gestures or handholding or by repeating phrases over and over.

Today, about 75 people are assembled by 9:30 a.m., under disconcerting signs that say things like Fingerprinting—Now Serving #823. Jenifer later explains that the signs record the number of people from January 1 to the present. Still, the signs just seem to magnify the "Waiting for Godot" atmosphere in the room. The Detroit office serves about 350 people a day and conducts about 1,300 naturalization interviews a month.

Jenifer doesn't identify herself, but plunges into the crowd, smiling and joking.

"Where are you from?" she asks one man.

"Nigeria," he replies tersely.

"What part?" Jenifer continues.

"Africa," he says.

"I know it's Africa, silly," she chides him, laughing. "I've been there. What part?"

By this time, the man and his companions are smiling. Everyone in the room is staring.

"Lagos," he says. "Have you been there?"

She has been accused of working the crowd, but "this is some of the most important work I do," she explains afterward. "I got a real feel for front-line work when I

worked for the INS processing refugees in Kenya a couple of years ago. It sure gives you a difference perspective on naturalization. It makes you realize that these are people's lives you're making decisions about."

Back in her office around 10:15 a.m., Jenifer sucks on another hard candy and meets with Harold Carter, an INS examiner who chairs a committee representing minorities in the Detroit district.

"Come on Harold, get comfortable," Jenifer coos as she scrabbles around on her desk looking for a pen. After Carter settles into a chair, she launches into her concerns: "There are no Hispanics in investigations . . . We don't have any representative [minority] groups at Sault Ste. Marie. We have to show we've tried to reach parity. Can we get people to work up there?"

Carter laughs, noting it's pretty cold at the Soo, which is an INS port-of-entry located in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. But they get serious again quickly. After all, there is a class-action suit in Los Angeles about lack of advancement among black INS officers.

After the meeting, she's off to the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel, which runs underneath the Detroit River, but first stops to order Girl Scout cookies from a coworker. "I should have ordered more," she muses. "My kids know I hide them under my bed."

Jenifer needs to see how work is progressing at the tunnel and Detroit's Ambassador Bridge—the largest commercial-vehicle entry port in the United States—on the "Portpass" program. Portpass allows pre-qualified drivers to use express lanes, which will speed up the flow of traffic.

"Traffic can be my worst nightmare,"

Jenifer says. "We have a federal mandate to get people inspected here in less than 20 minutes—and we have to keep it moving or the complaints start backing up." The INS inspects people crossing the border, while U.S. Customs agents inspect things, but the two cross-train and work together. To the public, they are virtually indistinguishable.

Touring the new tunnel Portpass office, Jenifer is complimentary about the countertops that will separate staff and customers. "Good," she notes. "I like them wide so nobody can reach across and grab our people."

She's less sanguine, however, about the Portpass signs in the traffic lanes at the tunnel. "The signs are too little," she complains. "I don't know if people will be able to see them."

At the bridge at noon, Jenifer is still obsessed with signage. She tells Norman Byron, port director for the bridge, that she's worried that people won't be able to see the express lane signs at night. He assures her that they will be well-lit.

The two tour a trailer-type office set up at the foot of the bridge to accommodate the new program and staff. Jenifer checks out every closet and toilet and pushes back part of the wall paneling that has bowed out. She nearly slips coming down the steps in the snow and asks when skid strips will be put in.

"The skid strip for steps costs \$3,000 a roll," Byron says. "Some things we can't do until the weather gets warmer."

Back in Byron's office, Jenifer banters with several INS agents and asks for their recommendations on good places to eat nearby. They direct her to a restaurant in Detroit's nearby Mexican Village that looks like a dive, but turns out to have decent food.

Jenifer orders the quesadillas and chicken enchiladas and ends up taking home a doggie bag of most of the food for her kids. "I'm a horrendous cook, so I love leftovers," she admits.

By 1 p.m., she's on her way to Detroit's Metro Airport to check on a request for more INS inspectors to accommodate a 60 percent increase in international passengers since 1993 due to airline mergers. It's a 45-minute drive to the airport, and on the way she talks about the mundane, yet important issues that face single parents, such as getting the laundry done and whether it's wise to hire a housekeeper.

Stuck in rush-hour traffic with Jenifer, you find yourself sharing the problems of raising teenagers and getting along with men. She seems more like an old friend by mid-afternoon than an interview subject. But then, her staff has warned you that Jenifer often "pulls an Oprah," or gets people to tell all unwittingly.

At the INS section of the airport, Michael Freeman, the supervisory immigration inspector at the airport, prints up a computer list of how passengers have increased on each airline since 1989. Jenifer studies the print-out and tells him she'll consider hiring 10 or 11 new inspectors to ease the crunch. Jenifer asks Freeman if he's lost weight. It's clear Freeman's busting to tell her something else and he finally does.

"I just found out my wife is having a baby," he says. They chat about children and health concerns. If Jenifer ever tires of the INS, she could probably have her own talk show.

She makes it a point to shake hands with or speak to all 12 of the INS inspectors on duty that afternoon before heading back to her office. The new hires, whose desks are piled with books like *The Art of Cross-Examination*, stiffen when Jenifer walks in the room. But within minutes they are relaxed.

Back at the office, Jenifer goes through the paperwork that has sprouted on her desk over the last few hours. Her secretary puts the most urgent notes on her chair. There are employee identification cards to sign, a quarterly meeting with immigration lawyers to arrange and an application for a bowling tournament with the heads of other federal agencies in Detroit, from the Secret Service to the FBI.

"Oh," Jenifer groans. "I need a coach to help me bowl better. I bowled an 80 last time and have yet to live down the shame."

By 4:45 p.m., Jenifer is walking out the door to pick up the girls. They are waiting for her in the school library, complaining about their eighth-grade class pictures.

Jenifer studies the photos as closely as she's looked at any paperwork today. "Yes, I'm keeping these for blackmail purposes," she says. The three of them burst out laughing.

By 5:15 p.m., the INS manager who insists that "fair management and families" are the cornerstones of her personal and professional life, is walking in the side door of her house holding the leftover chicken enchiladas in her free hand.

HONORING RALPH SPENCE

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding east Texan, Ralph Spence of Tyler, TX, who died recently at the age of 76. Ralph Spence was one of those extraordinary individuals who was successful in so many areas of his life. He devoted his energies to a variety of worthy causes in east Texas and beyond, and his presence will be sorely missed by all those who knew him.

Born January 4, 1919, in Yorktown, Ralph lived in Tyler most of his life. He served in the United States Navy during World War II and participated in the invasions of Normandy, southern France, Okinawa, and the Philippines. He was an independent oil operator in Tyler who contributed to the discovery of several oil fields. He served as vice president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, served on the IPAA executive committee and founded the Tyler Petroleum Club.

Ralph Spence was actively involved in his community. He was director of the former Citizens First National Bank, a life member and past chairman of the Salvation Army Board, past president of the Texas Rose Festival and Order of the Rose, president of the East Texas Symphony Association, past president of Robert E. Lee High School Parent Teachers Association, director of the East Texas Hospital Foundation, and past member and vice chairman of the Federal Bi-Racial Committee. He originated the Eisenhower International Golf Classic in Tyler and assisted in fundraising for the Tyler-Smith County Public Library.

Ralph also devoted countless hours on behalf of higher education. He was chairman of the development board of the University of Texas at Tyler and was the only man to serve on five University of Texas development boards—University of Texas at Austin, University of Texas at Tyler, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, College of Business Administration at the University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Texas Health Center at Tyler. As chairman of the University of Texas Chancellor's Council, he completed the acquisition of the Gutenberg Bible for the university. He received many awards and honors, including life membership in the Texas Congress of PTA, a public service award from Texas College in Tyler, the Pioneer Award from the East Texas Association of Petroleum Landmen, and community service award as chairman of Earl Campbell Day. He received the distinguished alumnus award from the University of Texas Ex-Students' Association Administration and from the University of Texas College of Business Administration, was named "The Centennial Dad" by the University of Texas Dad's Association and was appointed to the Texas College Coordinating Board. He also was listed in Men of Achievement in Texas.

An active member of Christ Episcopal Church, Ralph Spence held numerous lay positions in the church and was named lifetime vestry member. He was elected by the Diocese of Texas to serve as deputy or alternate to the general convention for 30 years and was elected by the general convention to the executive council of the National Church. He was a member of the executive board of the Episcopal Diocese of Texas and a representative to the Diocesan Council for 40 years.

Ralph is survived by his wife, Mary John Spence of Tyler; one son and daughter-in-law, Ralph Spence, Jr., and Tancy of Billings, MT; two daughters and sons-in-law, Louise and Guy Griffith of Dallas and Judy and Charles Tate of Houston; two brothers and sisters-in-law, Charles and Carolyn Spence of Raymondville and Pat and Judy Spence of Tyler; nine grandchildren and several nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, our lives are enriched by citizens like Ralph Spence, who devote their time and energies to our communities, churches

and schools. One of the benefits of being a Member of Congress is that you meet and get to know the Ralph Spences of the world—people who really care and really help others—who really love and are loved. There is no way to measure the good Ralph Spence did during his lifetime—and he will be missed. As we adjourn today, I join his family and many friends in paying our last respect to this exemplary citizen. His legacy will be felt for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIA ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Linden Industrial Association [LIA] which will celebrate its 60th anniversary on September 27, 1995.

Over the past 60 years, the LIA has faced many challenges and been active on many different fronts. These include offering advice on legislation at the local, State, and Federal level; working with municipal officials on tax, public safety, and education issues; improving the public image of the city of Linden and advocating various economic development projects. Perhaps LIA's most important function has been to facilitate communications between the local industrial community and public officials. Since the LIA was formed in 1935 in the midst of the Great Depression, it has advanced the interests of the Linden-area business community.

On September 27, the LIA will be celebrating its 60th anniversary with a special dinner entitled "Linden . . . 2000 and Beyond." In keeping with its progress-oriented charter, the focus of the evening will be on Linden's future, not its past.

Like most organizations, the LIA's able leadership has been responsible for much of its success. Individuals such as Anthony Soriano, president; Thomas Noble, 1st vice president; H.R. Van Handle, 2nd vice president; Kenneth Estabrook, secretary, and Eileen Williams, treasurer, deserve recognition for their essential role in making the LIA a vibrant organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to represent part of Linden, NJ, in Congress. I know first-hand many of the dedicated men and women who make up the business community there. I am continually impressed by the commitment these people have to their community and to New Jersey. Their leadership will help ensure that Linden, and Union County, will continue to be a center of economic activity in northern New Jersey for generations to come.

RETIREMENT OF STANLEY G. FEINSTEIN FROM THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to express appreciation for the tireless

public service of Mr. Stanley G. Feinstein, who retires this month from the General Accounting Office. At a time when budget-cutters seek to eliminate the GAO and cripple the Congress's ability to investigate Government waste, Mr. Feinstein's work exemplifies the valuable assistance that this Congress received every day from the GAO.

Over the course of his career, Mr. Feinstein helped document some serious abuses of the public trust. His legal analyses of Federal water projects provided this Congress with the factual information we needed to make significant changes in Federal water policy and in the authorization of specific water projects. Mr. Feinstein helped us to sort out the intricacies of the Colorado River Storage Project Act, the Garrison project, the Oahe project, the Central Valley project, the Colorado River Basin Project Act, to name just a few. He told us what was authorized and therefore legal, and what was unauthorized and therefore illegal.

I first met Mr. Feinstein in 1977 when he served on the staff of the San Luis Task Force, a presidentially appointed task force established to investigate abuses of a major Federal water project in my home State of California. Mr. Feinstein's work on that study uncovered abuses of reclamation law and demonstrated that large corporations were in fact receiving illegal subsidies from the Federal Treasury. These discoveries contributed in large part to the reforms embodied in the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992.

Mr. Feinstein has for many years demonstrated an incomparable understanding of natural resource law, attesting to the importance of the independent legal analysis that GAO staff brings to the legislative process. His contributions will be missed, and we wish him a long and happy retirement.

CHINA POLICY ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1995

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the longstanding and difficult issue of China's atrocious record on human rights and its most-favored-nation-trading status.

As a new Member of the House, I am not oblivious to the serious human rights abuses that China commits against its citizens. I was horrified by the slaughter of the students at Tienamen Square in 1989. And today am very troubled by the arrest of U.S. citizen Harry Wu. The students were crying out for freedom and justice, a practice that we take for granted in this country. Instead of negotiating an end to the demonstration, Premier Li Peng ordered the needless slaughter of unarmed civilians. I consider this an indefensible act beyond explanation.

But, the question remains, how do we as a body and as a country work to bring an end to the practices of the Chinese Government? Do we completely divest and not do business with over 1 billion people? Or, do we continue to invest and hope that by engaging the regime we can effect change from the inside? I fear that this is a difficult problem to reconcile.

I am committed to making sure that human rights are an integral part of U.S. foreign and trade policy. Recently, I have introduced, and passed, an amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriation bill that brings greater awareness to the human rights violations of the Ethiopian Government. It is in that vein that I wish to discuss the situation with China tonight. Even though the Ethiopians have made improvements in their human rights record, our Nation must continue to encourage and monitor the situation there. This policy must also be for China.

There are many practices that the Chinese Government engages in that anyone would find reprehensible.

Short "show" trials with only cursory attention to the facts of the case;

Executions by a gunshot to the back of the head. The convicted prisoner's family is then charged for the price of the bullet. I have been told that the Government has just increased the price of the bullet;

Gulag style prisons where slave labor is commonplace; and

The organs of executed prisoners are quickly removed for transplant. This begs the question of the motivation for many of executions.

I supported, with an overwhelming number of my colleagues, H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act. This bill, for the first time, requires that the President present a biannual report on the progress of China's human rights.

The China Policy Act has many points and congressional findings, such that:

Charges against American citizen and human rights activist Harry Wu should be immediately dismissed;

China has violated international standards regarding the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction;

China has engaged in a program of modernizing and expanding its military;

China continues its practice of lengthy detention without trial, torture, and inhumane treatment of prisoners, and has failed to release political prisoners such as Wei Jingsheng, Bao Tong, and Chen-Ziming;

China continues to restrict free speech and trade unions;

China does not allow access to prisons by humanitarian and human rights organizations;

China continues to crackdown on the pro-democracy movement;

China continues to harass journalists and the Voice of America;

China continues to engage in discriminatory and unfair trade practices, including products made with prison slave labor; and

China continues to repress Tibetans and other religious and ethnic minorities.

The passage of the China Policy Act is a step in the right direction. We must continue to pressure the Chinese Government for change. I realize that it is very difficult to balance the necessity to trade with an estimated \$600 billion economy and our Nation's commitment to human rights.

China must treat its citizens with basic decency.

China must stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. China must come into line with the rest of the civilized nations.

But, this body and this Nation must also carry the same standards of human rights for other nations with which we deal. Be it China, Cambodia, Bosnia, or Zaire, the United States must continue to be a beacon and champion of human rights for the rest of the world.

As a nation we can demand no less of ourselves and with those who are members of the United Nations and with whom we conduct business.

I am hopeful that China will continue to improve its human rights record. We must assist Harry Wu in his efforts to be free and be diligent in our insistence that China comply with basic human rights standards. Time is running out and the patience of many of my colleagues is wearing thin. Soon, China will no longer be a favored nation. The clock is running and only the Chinese can make it stop. My support and vote for H.R. 2058 along with my colleagues is a start and we must do more.